

THE ANGLICAN

A QUARTERLY NEWS-LETTER OF
THE AMERICAN BRANCH OF
THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY

ADVENT 1948

VOL. IV, NO. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial: Lambeth, Amsterdam and Moscow	2
The Consecration of The Eucharist. By the Editor	4
The Liturgical Movement. By The Rev. Dr. Nelson Rightmyer....	15
Anglican Society Literature Available	23
An Anglican Society Directory	24

LAMBETH, AMSTERDAM AND MOSCOW

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE of 1948 has passed into history. Some of its achievements were excellent. For example, its exposition of the Christian doctrine of man is one of the finest things that has appeared for years. And its reaffirmation of the Christian doctrine of marriage as sacramental and indissoluble was on the whole excellent. More debatable are the resolutions dealing with Christian unity. To some these may appear to offer a pattern for the reunion of Christendom as a whole. To others, with greater reason, they may appear to offer a pattern for the disintegration and liquidation of the Anglican Communion.

We have to face facts. A large number of Anglicans in South India have fused with a number of denominations there to form what is called the "South India United Church." The formularies of faith of this body are extremely vague. The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds are retained in some sense, but apparently unlimited freedom of interpretation is to be allowed. And of course the *sense* of the Creed is the Creed. Arius would have had no difficulty in accepting the Nicene Creed if he had had the same "freedom of interpretation" that the South India United Church concedes. Those who believe in Christ as God and Saviour, and those who believe that He was mere creature could both have accepted the Creed under these conditions—and the acceptance would have been a hollow mockery.

As regards Order, the new denomination will have what is called an "Episcopate," but it will be an "Episcopate" whose validity would be denied by the Eastern Orthodox Churches and by the Catholic world in general. Many of our own Bishops felt and expressed the most serious misgivings as regards the "Orders" of the new sect. If we recognize the clergy of this denomination as being clergy of the Holy Catholic Church, and if we permit them to officiate as such in any parts of the Anglican Communion, we shall lower the value of our own Orders in the eyes of those Orthodox who at present are inclined to accept us, and will raise an insurmountable barrier to reunion with the Eastern Orthodox Churches and with Catholic Christendom as a whole. We shall also risk the disruption of such unity as we already have in the Anglican Communion. It is hard to see what is gained by any such schemes of "unity" as this.

The Amsterdam Assembly has given to the world a message which rings with a genuine faith in Christ as God and Saviour and with a zeal for His glory. The spirit which animated the Assembly was admirable. Whether two such different movements as "Faith and Order" and "Life and Work" can best be combined in one large and unwieldy Assembly is more open to doubt. At any rate the World Council of Churches is now definitely launched. The question which only the future

can answer conclusively is whether the World Council will be in reality an instrument of Christian unity and ecumenicity, or whether it will become a third center of divided Christendom, Rome and Moscow being the other two. An illuminating article by Dean Nes of Nashotah House in "The Living Church" (October 17, 1948) has set forth both the strength and limitations of Amsterdam.

The failure of the Orthodox Churches behind the "iron curtain" to send representatives to Amsterdam, made the Assembly much less ecumenical in character than it otherwise would have been. It remains to be seen whether the World Council in the future will approximate an ecumenical outlook or will become simply an instrument of pan-Protestantism.

In some ways the Conference of the Eastern Orthodox Churches in Moscow was more important than either the Lambeth Conference or the Amsterdam Assembly, although it has received little notice in either our secular press or our Church press. Most of the Eastern Orthodox Churches were represented there. The occasion of the Conference was the celebration of the five hundredth anniversary of the independence of the Russian Church as an autocephalous part of the Orthodox Communion. The Conference found fault with the Ecumenical Movement as an attempt to realize union "on a social-economical, nay, even on a political basis," rather than on the basis of the grace of God. It is clear that a good deal of misunderstanding exists in Orthodox circles of the real purpose and nature of the Ecumenical Movement. The Conference also condemned in the harshest possible language political Romanism.

Most interesting to Anglicans will be the report on the validity of the Anglican hierarchy (*Ob Angelikanskoi Ierarchii*). The Conference made it clear that the question of the recognition of the validity ("dyeistvitelnosti," literally reality) of the Anglican hierarchy can be considered only in conjunction with the question of the unity of faith and profession with the Orthodox Church. The Conference found fault with some of the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles, especially as regards the Sacraments, and more particularly as regards the Sacrament of Holy Orders. Until this teaching is corrected, the Orthodox Church cannot recognize the validity of Anglican Ordinations.

If, however, an authoritative document should be set forth by a Conference of the Clergy of the Anglican Communion, and approved by the Head of the Anglican Church (whatever that may mean), expressing the Orthodox teaching as regards the Sacraments and, more specifically the Sacrament of Holy Orders, then it would be possible for the Orthodox Church, by conciliar action, to recognize by "*Economia*" the validity of Anglican Orders (literally Ordinations, *Chirotonii*).

On the whole, the attitude taken towards Anglicanism, in contrast with Protestantism and Romanism, was both moderate and conciliatory. One thing we should all do well to notice is the intimate and inseparable connection of faith and valid Orders in the conception of the Orthodox Church, and the fact that one cannot have floating Orders, so to speak, detached from the Church herself. This principle, which is firmly grounded in the teaching of the undivided Church, to which Anglicans and Orthodox both appeal, has a very wide application—and not least to the question of the South India scheme and certain other projects of reunion.

THE CONSECRATION OF THE EUCHARIST

By the Editor

IT IS WELL KNOWN that the question of the consecration of the Eucharist is one of the great questions that divide Christendom. Are the Holy Mysteries consecrated by a formula ("This is My Body," "this is My Blood"), or by prayer? The former is the position taken by the Roman Catholic Church and by a considerable number of Anglo-Catholics; the latter is the position of the Orthodox Eastern Churches, and, as I hope to show, of historic Anglicanism, as well as that of the early Church and the Fathers in general. Where it is held that the Holy Eucharist is consecrated by a formula (i. e. by the recitation of Our Lord's words of administration in the "Canon of the Mass"), the tendency is to emphasize the role of the human agent, the consecrating priest; where it is held that the Mysteries are consecrated by prayer, the primary emphasis is on the role of God, and particularly of the Holy Spirit. The former conception at least lends itself to sub-personal or quasi-magical views of the Sacrament (though of course it does not *necessarily* involve them). Thus a few years ago at a great Eucharistic Congress of the Roman Catholic Church, the preacher said: "In a few moments the bell will ring, and God will obey the command of His creature, His priest, and will appear on this altar under the veils of bread and wine." Such a conception is of course impossible where the emphasis is laid upon the Holy Spirit as the Consecrator, and on consecration by (or rather in response to) prayer, resting back on the command and institution of Christ.

Up to a few years ago, scholars were tending toward the recognition that the consecration took place as a result of the great Prayer of Thanksgiving taken as a whole, and that within this Prayer of Thanksgiving the Invocation (either of the Holy Spirit or of the Divine Word), had from very early times a special importance. The Invocation of the Holy Spirit, or rather the petition that He might be sent to consecrate the Elements,

was found to be much earlier than the developed theology of the Holy Spirit in the fourth century. The discovery of the lost *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus revealed that the Liturgy of the Church of Rome in the early part of the third century contained such an Invocation of the Holy Spirit. Other Western Liturgies of a later date had one. The Eastern Liturgies, almost without exception, contained such an epiklesis, although some of them asked for the intervention of the Divine Word, rather than of the Holy Spirit. The primitive character of the epiklesis seemed virtually assured.

But now it is claimed that Dom Gregory Dix, in his monumental work "*The Shape of the Liturgy*" has disposed of all this. An Invocation of the Holy Spirit is not to be found outside Syria until the fourth century, it is stated. The theology of Consecration, which we associate with the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eastern Liturgies, was the daring innovation of St. Cyril of Jerusalem. It got into the Liturgy of Constantinople. The Byzantine influence spread it far and wide in the Mediterranean world, especially after the conquests of Justinian the Great. The Invocation in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus should, according to Dix, be regarded as an interpolation. Other Western Liturgies which seemed to contain the Invocation really asked for the Holy Spirit to sanctify, not the Elements, but the communicants. In other words, they looked, not to consecration, but to reception. In other Eastern Liturgies of early date, such as that of Addai and Mari, what looks like a clear Invocation of the Holy Spirit, was really an Invocation of Christ, the Divine Word, the word "Spirit" being used loosely to indicate a Divine Presence or energy, or else the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, rather than the Third.

Furthermore Dom Gregory thinks that the "innovation" of St. Cyril of Jerusalem attributing the Consecration to the Holy Spirit contradicts the truly primitive conception of Christ Himself as the Great High Priest and the Consecrator of the Eucharist.

What are we to say in regard to all this?

First of all that St. Cyril has at least one much earlier predecessor who teaches definitely consecration by the Holy Spirit. Roughly a century before his time the author of the *Didascalia* (about 250 A. D.) says that "the Eucharist, through the Holy Spirit, is accepted and sanctified." Dix notices this precedent and acknowledges that the author shared with St. Cyril the view that consecration is effected by the action of the Holy Spirit, but it seems to me that he glides over this precedent all too easily and attributes far too much originality to St. Cyril.

As regards St. Cyril himself, it must be remembered that his "Catechetical Lectures" were delivered when he was a presbyter and before

sort of conversion of the Elements, but for something quite different, namely for the *benefits of communion*." (p. 183)

This is jumping to conclusions with a vengeance. The petition asks that the Holy Spirit may "rest upon the oblation" and "bless and hallow it," not the communicants. As a result of this blessing and hallowing, the benefits of communion are to be available. But the prayer itself is for the blessing and impliedly the conversion of the Elements. In any case the action of the Holy Spirit is first upon the Elements themselves and through them on the communicants. In this respect it resembles the Invocation in The American Book of Common Prayer, which some have likewise attempted to explain away in a purely receptionist sense. A close examination of the documents makes this impossible.

Furthermore Dix assumes that here, and in general in the early Liturgies, the term "Holy Spirit" refers not to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, but to the Second, or to a Divine Presence or Energy. Here again the evidence will not bear him out. It is perfectly true that the term "Spirit" is used somewhat loosely, both in the New Testament and in early Christian writings, to mean a Divine Presence or Energy, or the Divine Nature of Christ, or the Divine Word, as well as at times the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. But "*Holy Spirit*" in the patristic writings almost invariably means the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity.* And the burden of proof rests squarely on the person who tries to show in any given instance that it means something else.

Thus Clement of Rome (95 A. D.) writes to the Corinthians,

"Have we not one God, one Christ? Is there not one Spirit of grace poured out upon us?" (I Clement, Ch. 46)

Here the Trinitarian interpretation of "Spirit" seems most natural. In Chapter 42 he has written "Christ therefore was sent forth by God, and the apostles by Christ. Both these appointments, then, were made in an orderly way, according to the will of God. Having therefore received their orders, and being fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and established in the word of God, with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth proclaiming that the kingdom of God was at hand."

"The Martyrdom of Polycarp," written about the middle of the second century, makes the martyr exclaim, "I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, along

* Hermas is an apparent exception. The phrase, however, "The son is the Holy Spirit" (Similitudes 5:5) refers to the son in the parable he has just given. The words that follow are "the slave is the Son of God." Elsewhere Hermas appears to teach the existence of two Sons of God. In any case Hermas's "explanations" are confusion worse confounded and it is precarious to build much on such an utterly muddle-headed writer.

the virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive, not by intercourse, but by power." (*Apology*, Ch. 33)

But in general, though the word "Spirit" in Justin is capable of various interpretations according to the context, nevertheless "*Holy Spirit*," except in this one passage, seems to mean the Third Person of the Trinity. This is also true of the phrase "prophetic Spirit." For example:

"Our teacher of these things is Jesus Christ, who also was born for this purpose, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judaea, in the times of Tiberius Caesar; and that we reasonably worship Him, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in the second place, and the prophetic Spirit, in the third, we will prove." (Ch. 13)

"He (Plato) gives the second place to the Logos which is with God, who he said was placed crosswise in the universe; and the third place to the Spirit." (Ch. 60)

Speaking of baptism he writes:

"They then are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe (Tōn holōn), and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of (the) Holy Spirit (Pneumatōs Hagiou), they then receive the washing with water. For Christ also said, 'except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'" (Ch. 61)

"There is pronounced over him who chooses to be born again, and has repented of his sins, the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe; he who leads to the laver the person that is to be washed calling him by this name alone. For no one can utter the name of the ineffable God; and if any one dare to say that there is a name, he raves with a hopeless madness. And this washing is called illumination, because they who learn these things are illuminated in their understandings. And in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of (the) Holy Ghost (Pneumatōs Hagiou), who through the prophets foretold all things about Jesus, he who is illuminated is washed." (Ch. 61)

Again Justin Martyr writes:

"The Jews, accordingly, being throughout of opinion that it was the Father of the Universe who spake to Moses, though He who spake to him was indeed the Son of God, who is called both Angel and Apostle, are justly charged, both by the Spirit of prophecy and

the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (Book 4, Ch. 17) He adds in the same Chapter, "The Lord, receiving this as a gift from His Father, does Himself also confer it upon those who are partakers of Himself, sending the Holy Spirit upon all the earth."

Again,

"We have need of the dew of God, that we be not consumed by fire, nor be rendered unfruitful, and that where we have an accuser there we may have also an Advocate, the Lord commending to the Holy Spirit His own man, who had fallen among thieves, whom He Himself compassionated, and bound up his wounds, giving two royal *denaria*; so that we, receiving by the Spirit the image and superscription of the Father and the Son, might cause the *denarium* entrusted to us to be fruitful, counting out the increase (thereof) to the Lord." (Book 4, Ch. 17)

As Dom Gregory Dix lays a good deal of emphasis on Hippolytus and adduces him in support of the view "Holy Spirit" means the "Word" or "Son of God" rather than the Third Person of the Trinity, it is well to examine his evidence carefully. In the fourth chapter of his work "Against Noetus," Hippolytus writes, speaking of the Son, "He was Word, He was Spirit, He was Power." Here "Spirit" seems to refer to the Divine nature of the Word. Likewise in the sixteenth chapter of the same work he writes, "What is it that is begotten of Him but just the Spirit, that is to say, the Word?"

Elsewhere, however, the term "Spirit" clearly means the Third Person of the Trinity, as in the passage: "It is through this Trinity that the Father is glorified, for the Father willed, the Son did, the Spirit manifested." And where the phrase "Holy Spirit" or "the Holy Spirit" is used, it is quite clear that the Third Person of the Trinity is referred to, thus, "We see the Word Incarnate and we know the Father by Him, we believe in the Son, we worship the Holy Spirit." (Ch. 12)

"The Father indeed is one, but there are two persons, because there is also the Son and then there is the Third, the Holy Spirit It is the Father Who commands and the Son Who obeys and the Holy Spirit Who gives understanding. The Father Who is above all and the Son Who is through all, and the Holy Spirit Who is in all. And we cannot otherwise think of one God but by believing in truth in Father, Son and Holy Spirit." (Ch. 14)

The ascription at the end of this work summarizes Hippolytus' own teaching and that of the New Testament and of the Fathers generally.

"To Him be the glory and the power with the Father and the Holy Spirit in the Holy Church, both now and forever and even forever more. Amen."

In "*The Apostolic Tradition*" the candidate for baptism is asked: "Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? . . . Dost thou believe in Christ Jesus, the Son of God, Who was born of Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary? . . . Dost thou believe in the Holy Spirit in the Holy Church?" Here the distinction of "Christ" and the "Holy Spirit" appears with startling clearness. Here "Holy Spirit," in the Trinitarian sense is clearly the cause of the Incarnation (I quote from Dom Gregory Dix "*The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*," pp. 36-37).

Incidentally the presence or absence of the definite article before "Holy Spirit" seems to make no difference in the meaning of the term in the Fathers generally, although, of course, in the New Testament it sometimes makes a great deal of difference.

The celebration of the Liturgy in Hippolytus concludes with the ascription "that we may praise and glorify Thee through Thy Son (or Child) Jesus Christ, through Whom be glory and honor to Thee with (the) Holy Spirit in Thy Holy Church, now and forever and unto the ages of ages." This makes it overwhelmingly probable that the clause in the same prayer "Whom Thou didst send from Heaven into the Virgin's womb and Who conceived within her was made flesh and demonstrated to be Thy Son, being born of Holy Spirit and a Virgin" refers to the Third Person of the Trinity as the cause of the Incarnation. In view of the general use by Hippolytus of the term "Holy Spirit" or "The Holy Spirit" to mean the Third Person of the Trinity, the argument for the retention of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Liturgy itself: ("We pray that thou wouldest send Thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of the Holy Church") is immensely strengthened.

In short, the ambiguity of the term "Spirit" in many of the Fathers must be balanced by the fact that the term "*Holy Spirit*" in nearly all cases clearly refers to the Third Person of the Trinity. This makes it virtually certain, therefore, that the term is used in a Trinitarian sense in the early Liturgies and that, therefore, there is an Invocation of the Holy Spirit in this sense, both in the Liturgy of Addai and Mari, and that of Hippolytus himself.

Dom Gregory Dix admits that one can find Western prayers and teaching, inspired by the "Eastern" doctrine, that the Invocation of the Holy Spirit consecrates the Eucharist, but he insists "there is nothing which can be thought to antedate that great expansion of Byzantine ecclesiastical influence in the West which accompanied the Western expeditions of Justinian in the sixth century." (p. 296)

Dix seems to have forgotten the clear teaching of Optatus of Milevis about 368 A. D. in his work on the "Schism of the Donatists." He writes, "what is so sacrilegious as to break down, raze, and remove the altars of God on which you too formerly offered, on which were laid the vows of the people and the members of Christ, whither Almighty God was invoked and whither having been petitioned for, the Holy Spirit descended." (quo Deus omnipotens invocatus sit, quo postulatus descendit Spiritus sanctus?—*de Schism. Don.*, Bk. VI:I.)

It should be noted that St. Optatus is writing only a few years after Cyril of Jerusalem, and in view of the ecclesiastical isolation of the Church in Africa, his view can scarcely be attributed to the influence of Cyril, and it antedated Justinian's conquest by some centuries. He clearly attributes the Consecration of the Eucharist to the work of the Holy Spirit, descending at the Invocation of the Church. Furthermore Optatus seems simply to carry on the ancient African tradition.

St. Cyprian a century earlier had written that "the oblation (of the Eucharist) cannot be sanctified there where the Holy Spirit is not." (Nec oblatio sanctificari illic possit ubi Spiritus Sanctus non sit.)—Epistle LXIII:4) (Oxford ed. LXV)

And Cyprian, Dom Gregory Dix recognizes, is one of those who most strongly insist on the doctrine of the heavenly priesthood of Christ and on His being the High Priest Who offers our Eucharist. Apparently Cyprian, like Isidore of Seville, or Pope Gelasius or Nicholas I, and a host of other writers, Eastern and Western, saw no contradiction between Christ being the great High Priest who offers our Eucharist and the action of the Holy Spirit in making Him present and effecting the Consecration.

Dom Gregory Dix also supposes that the older Western Invocations—those, that is to say, which antedated the conquests of the Emperor Justinian and the resulting spread of the Byzantine influence—were petitions for the action of the Holy Spirit on the communicants, but not on the Elements themselves. However, the language of Cyprian is not easy to reconcile with this hypothesis and that of St. Optatus excludes it. Dix does quote a passage from Fulgentius of Ruspe (died 533 A. D.), as a representative of the African Church, which taken by itself would be capable of his interpretation, but he has apparently overlooked other passages in Fulgentius which quite clearly attribute the Consecration to the action of the Holy Spirit.

Fulgentius asks why the Holy Spirit alone is asked for to consecrate the oblation.

"Why if the sacrifice is offered to the whole Trinity, is the sending of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the gift of our oblation asked for, as if in fact, that I may so speak, God the Father Himself, from

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

By The Rev. Dr. Nelson Rightmyer

The Divinity School in Philadelphia

(A paper read before the Philadelphia Catholic Club, November 17, 1948)

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY has witnessed a new interest in the meaning of liturgical worship, but in discussing this new interest in worship known as the Liturgical Movement I ought to point out that ecclesiology (or as it is sometimes called, "ecclesiastical millinery") and church architecture are but side-shows to the main attraction. Nor is breakfast in the parish hall after communion an essential element in this new movement. This needs to be pointed out, for far too many people think liturgics has to do primarily with these non-essentials. The shape of the chasuble, the number of lights on the altar, the position of the pulpit or tabernacle are very minor incidentals in this revival in a demand for perfection in liturgical worship. The Liturgical Movement is centered primarily in a reemphasis on the relationship of Man and God, and between man and his fellow men. The Liturgical Movement has been said to be the nucleus about which the Summary of the Law ought to be built. A true understanding and participation in the liturgy is fundamental not only to our work as priests, but such participation is fundamental to the fulfillment of the Christian Life itself.

This new interest in the liturgy is said to have had its origin in the desire of five young Germans to know more about the service in which they had been assisting for years, so in Holy Week of 1914 they spent a week in such study at the Benedictine Monastery at Maria Laach. The war of 1914 interrupted the development of this revival, but soon after the war appeared the magazine "Ecclesia Orans" (the praying church) to be followed in 1921 by the first *Year Book of Liturgical Science*. In our own country the Benedictines of Collegeville, Minnesota, began "Orate Fratres," a monthly devoted to the truer understanding of the liturgy. This same interest spread to the other liturgical churches and soon the serious studies of Duchesne, Fortesque, Cabrol, Brightman, Frere and a host of others were being popularized for the benefit of those who had not advanced to the place where these serious writers would be of value to them. In our own church such works as Fr. Hebert's *Liturgy and Society* and his *Parish Communion* as well as the writings of the late Dean Ladd and of Dr. Massey Shepherd were having considerable circulation and influence.

The first impression an Anglican receives from a survey of the literature of the Liturgical Movement is that this is old stuff to us—that we

The church was never meant to be so, and the rite of the liturgy kept alive an ideal, but this was lost in the popular understanding of the rite.

Even the hymns of the Reformation age reflected this individualism. It makes little difference whether we turn to Ignatius' "My God I love thee" or to Charles Wesley's "Jesus, lover of my soul," the relationship between God and Man is an individualistic thing. Today there is a new spirit abroad. We now know that man cannot live by himself. In social thinking Europe is a generation ahead of us, as it so often is, but even the most hide-bound reactionary must recognize that the days of the pioneer are over. No longer can a man stake out his homestead and there by his own efforts, or the efforts of his family, lead an independent life. Today we are dependent upon a whole host of people and upon an intricately crossed line of supply. No one is self-sufficient. (Incidentally, the plain people of Lancaster County who refuse to use machinery because they would be dependent upon electric lines or gasoline supplies from outside are being completely consistent and logical followers of the sixteenth century. They intend to depend upon no man save God and their own efforts.) Today that is all different for every one of us.

This interdependence is not recognized by everyone yet, and our churches too often are filled with those who insist on things remaining "as they were in the beginning, are now, and ever shall be." But there is a growing realization that the church and its whole membership is the Body of which Jesus Christ is the head. But will this Church have any influence upon the growing communal ideas which are spreading abroad among the "great unwashed"? Can the church make use of this communal idea prevalent in our age and make it Christian? The Liturgical Movement has undoubtedly been influenced by this new thinking of the age in which we live. An interesting book along this line is "France Today" by Claire Bishop in one portion of which he describes what the church and the seminaries are doing along communal lines. It is well worth reading. With this change in emphasis from the individualistic into the interdependent we have a change in emphasis in public worship. We have the opportunity to make the liturgy what its original nomenclature signified—the public work of the family of God. This relationship is not one of individual communication with God apart from the community, but rather one of real corporate worship. When we grasp this ideal then worship takes on new meaning. This does, however, entail some outward change in our appointments. New arrangements often are found advisable to bring about a new realization of corporate activity in worship. In some parishes representative laity are now bringing up the elements of the communion from the west end of the church at the time of the offertory in order to emphasize the true nature of our offering. Personally, I am not

offered by the community. The simplest way to do this is to use no more than three settings for the whole year. When I was a parish priest we used the *Missa de Angelis* and Merbecke's Communion Service in the St. Dunstan Edition for festal and penitential seasons and we used a little setting by John Brown in the *C to C Series* for all other occasions. Within a short time the whole congregation knew the service from singing it on Sunday. The advantage of these particular settings was that I could get them in small booklets which were distributed in the pews. The Rev. W. S. Baker, Vicar of St. Johns, Newcastle upon Tyne, tells of using Merbecke every Sunday and principal holy day without any feeling of undo repetition.

Mesnard goes on with his analysis of the aims to be desired in making the mass *a sacrifice offered by the community* by insisting that the communion be distributed during the mass so that the faithful consider their communion as a participation in the mass, and priests should abstain from Requiem masses on Sundays and feast days. The faithful have a right to the mass of the day, with the color of the day. Here we are generally far ahead of the French and German parish priests, for such a policy would indeed be the rare exception with us, although there has been a reactionary group who would like to reintroduce the practice of receiving communion outside of mass. Equally exceptional with us would be his last point of *the sacrifice offered by the community*, that is, that non-liturgical prayers ought to be suppressed and that the laity should join in the active participation in the service. We are not plagued by a multiplicity of devotional books which are used by the laity in preference to active participation, but we are plagued by priests who prefer "iddy-biddy" books of prayers in preference to our official rite which we are required on oath to use.

Mesnard's second point in the liturgical program is that of renewing the sacramental sense. Here again, we are far in advance of most of the Roman Churches I am familiar with. In most of the parishes of our church we have some small congregation at the administration of Holy Baptism. In other churches the rubric is being followed and Holy Baptism is being administered after the second lesson of matins and evensong, but in none that I know of is it administered in the sacristy as is the case in so many Roman parishes. And this is also true of the lesser sacraments. We do try to make them the work of the whole community, and not the work of the individual.

Preaching also has its place in the action of the community at God's public work, but the preaching ought to be no mere fulmination for the sake of something to say. A text ought not be a spring-board from which one jumps out into far fields totally unrelated to the work of the moment.

The sermon ought to be directly inspired by the liturgy. The sermon ought to be an integral part of the mass, the liturgical year is really an instruction in the whole of our religion, dogmatic, biblical and moral. If our sermon really grows out of the liturgy, rather than be an interruption in the action, then we shall be fulfilling the real meaning of the preaching.

The Liturgical Movement in France and Germany is also emphasizing the family pew. In the past much stress has been made on organizational activities. Special masses were said for the benefit of trade unions, for the mechanics of particular shops, for scout organizations, and the like. Now the movement is in the opposite direction and the attempt is being made to transform the natural family into the spiritual family by having them worship together regularly. This is a wonderful idea, but I doubt that this portion of the movement will be too successful. The twentieth century is the age of the organized group. The union, the club, the team are to our age much more important than the family, and the church will need to work with these groups to make them Christian. Just as the Anglican reformers of the sixteenth century were far ahead of their age and tried to put most of these principles of common worship to work in the Book of Common Prayer, yet failed because the individualistic age was not ripe for their community type of worship, so too our age is that of the organization and the factory unit. If we fly in the face of this tendency, we shall miss an opportunity. I should like to see our churches make more of the community spirit which can be developed in factories and unions, and to turn these activities Christ-wise. In England an attempt has been made with factory chaplaincies, and I understand the work has been rather successfully carried on. I know we have had some experiments along this line in this country, but from the few reports I have had of them, I have come to the conclusion that they are carried out on a non-denominational, humanistic-social service level, which we Catholics could not agree to sponsor in their present form.

The Liturgical Movement in the Roman Church has also been characterized by an attempt to make the liturgy intelligible in other ways. In some few places attempts have been made at vernacular masses, but this has received a severe set-back within the past year. The Sacred Congregation of Rites has issued new regulations condemning the practice, and has put greater limitations on the permission to say mass in the vernacular. Personally I hope they never give permission to do so—that is from the standpoint of divided Christendom—for if the Roman mass were to be put into English in this country, we should have to work much harder. The other manner in which the language handicap is being met in the Roman Church is by teaching more and more liturgical Latin in the schools and by providing bi-lingual missals in place of the old-fashioned Prayer

Book which had little relation to the action going on at the altar. The cry today is—"Pray the mass," and we can congratulate ourselves that thanks to a vernacular liturgy, we are far in advance on the Roman Church in this respect.

Of course, the sacramental principle includes the idea of outward signs representing spiritual truth. So it is impossible that the new spirit of the Christian community at its worship should continue forms and ceremonies which are not in keeping with the ideals of its worship. Some return to better ceremonial is inevitable. Two aspects which we inherit from the second generation of Tractarians are being questioned. The romanticism of the Tractarian age brought many men to the idea that Gothic architecture was the only Christian architecture. This, I am glad to say, is now on the way out. If you have seen the new English churches as shown in the little book *Fifty New Churches*, or if you have read Addleshaw's new book on the development of Church architecture, you will remember that Gothic Churches are not all that could be desired. It is true that for many Americans Gothic architecture is Christian architecture, but this is only because they unconsciously think religion must be put in a separate compartment from the rest of life. Thirteenth century church buildings are an anachronism in twentieth century America. If the church is to mean more than a decadent ceremonial form of a long past age which we adhere to for special occasions, we must bring our church down to the present day. Thirteenth Century Gothic will be no help in converting America. Several weeks ago we had a prominent business man attend the Divinity School. He came for several classes, he stayed through evensong, and then remained for dinner. Quite frankly we had brought him to the school with the hope that we could separate him from some of his dollars. His reaction was interesting, if painful. Beautiful as our chapel is,—and I love it with its polychrome and gold leaf,—evensong sung to the plain chant transports one back to what we are pleased to call the "age of faith" (though I doubt the accuracy of the term),—but it left this man cold. He got the feeling that we were secluding ourselves from the problems of our times. He thought we were retreating from reality. To him the whole plan was outmoded, and what is more, inefficient. He was willing to put up some money, but, he said, "Let's scrap this whole business. It costs more than it is worth just to keep it up. Put up some modern efficient buildings, and then you will be getting somewhere." This is the effect our church buildings have upon the modern man. He works in an office building or a shop which is wholly functional, efficient. He drives a car which is geared to efficiency; he lives in a home which is built for modern living, and then we expect him to become enthusiastic about our religion which is draped in medieval accretions. Some of the attempts to build

modern churches have not been too successful, but at least they are not pup cathedrals in imitation thirteenth century forms.

Another idea being questioned by those interested in the Liturgical Movement is that practice of the Post Tractarians which separated priest from people—the chancel choir. The result too often has been priest and choir putting on an act in which the congregation are present as mere spectators. The whole idea of the liturgical movement is that the whole congregation shall “get into the act.” So some churches are being built to permit this. The John Keble Church at Mill Hill is a perfect example of this. Here the choir has been placed in the center of the nave, in the midst of the congregation. This plan does two things—it puts the choir where it will be the greatest help in leading the singing, and it makes it one with the rest of the family of God. The plan is worth consideration, as is the old-fashioned gallery-choir.

One idea which is being stressed within the Roman Church is that of the common meal aspect of the Eucharist. To emphasize this some leading churches have the priest face the congregation while celebrating. I hope we do not take this up for some time to come. In the Roman Church it may be right. They have emphasized the sacrificial aspect of the mass to the place where they have had a tendency to forget the “supper-aspect.” It is not so with most Anglican congregations. Far too many of our people, even in the best instructed catholic parishes lay far more emphasis on the “supper-aspect” than they do on the sacrifice, and therefore I think it would be a mistake to change this bit of ceremonial at this time. There are many side-issues of the Liturgical Movement comparable to these which need to be carefully thought out and taken or left, not because they are the newest fashion in ecclesiastical millinery, but because they do or do not emphasize all the aspects of our worship of Almighty God as the offering of the whole community of God.

As Dom Gregory Dix has said, “. . . It is no merely ecclesiological or archeological fad. It seeks to return behind the medieval ‘clerical’ distortion of the eucharist to the truer and deeper conception of the Church of the Martyrs, only because it has first recovered a more authentic notion of what is involved in the doctrine that the Church is the mystical Body of Christ, that the sovereign spirit of the Risen Life of Jesus is the very breath of her life. It will be found that just in those quarters where the Liturgical Movement has obtained the strongest hold, there that new longing for the unity of all Christians, that new Catholic zeal for scientifically truthful historical studies, that new Catholic demand for social reforms, that new Catholic energy of Apostolate among those who have not the faith, both at home and abroad, have also found their most remarkable developments. This is not surprising. Where the Church is

true to her calling as the Body of Christ, she must needs offer herself and all her members in sacrifice to God in union with the sacrifice of her Head. . . .”

ANGLICAN SOCIETY LITERATURE AVAILABLE

An Invitation to Become a Member of the Anglican Society.

Suggestions for Servers.

A Synopsis of the Ceremonies of a Plain Celebration.

Rites and Ceremonies.

Your Eucharist.

Why Not Try the Prayer Book Use?

English Catholicism.

Notes on Chanting.

Continuity in the Anglican Communion.

A Study of the Prayer for Consecration.

An Explanation of the Principles and Aims of the Anglican Society.

The Anglican Society's Opportunity in America.

There is no charge for single copies. If material is desired in quantities a donation is requested to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Address the Chairman of the Extension Committee.

Keeping a supply of literature in your tract case with applications for membership is one way of interesting new members in the Society.

AN ANGLICAN SOCIETY DIRECTORY

Honorary President: *The Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, D. D.*
68 South Swan St.
Albany 6, N. Y.

President: *The Very Rev. Edward R. Welles*
St. Paul's Cathedral
Buffalo 2, N. Y.

Vice President: *The Rev. J. Wilson Sutton, D. D.*
1 West 72nd St.
New York, N. Y.

Secretary: *The Rev. Charles E. Hill*
Twin Oaks
Williamstown, Mass.

Treasurer: *Mr. William D. H. Lackmann*
Livingston, Columbia Co., N. Y.

Chairman Extension Committee: *The Rev. George Grambs*
Bayonne, N. J.

Editor: *The Rev. William H. Dunphy, Ph. D., S. T. D., D. D.*
St. Mark's Church
1625 Locust Street
Philadelphia 3, Pa.

Managing Editor: *The Rev. Allen Brown*
Hudson, N. Y.

The objects of the American Branch of the Anglican Society are:

1. To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer.
2. To uphold and appreciate the Anglican Use both in rite and ceremonial.

Membership is invited on the broad principle of loyalty to the American Prayer Book, Constitution and Canons and the Common Law of the Anglican Communion. Apply to either the Secretary or the Chairman of the Extension Committee for membership. The dues are \$2.00 a year, which includes subscription to "The Anglican" and to "The English Catholic."

For additional information address the Chairman of the Extension Committee or any of the officers.

